

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 12
August 9, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thoughtful review of the application. The status of the claims is as follows: **Claim 1, Claims and 2 – 48 are Pending** in the present application. **Claims 1, 6, 11, 24, 25, 33, 36, and 44 have been Amended** herein. **Claim 3 has been Canceled** but is reintroduced herein as **Previously Presented Claim 46**. **New Claims 47 and 48 were added**. Amendments to the claims are described below in the **PRESENT AMENDMENT**.

I. PRESENT AMENDMENT

Independent **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44** were amended herein to particularly point out and distinctly point out the subject matter the Applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, those claims now recite that the memory array is "*re-writable*" and is positioned over active circuitry in the substrate, the active circuitry having multiple layers of conductive paths, and the active circuitry and the multiple layers of conductive paths are able to withstand high temperature processing at a high temperature. Claim 33 was further amended to recite layers that are stable a temperature of at least 450 °C. Support for the amendments can at least be found in **FIGS. 1A, 1B, 1C, and 5 of the Drawings and Paragraphs 0019, 0019.1 – 0019.2, 0027 – 0028, 0037.1 – 0037.11, and 0038 – 0043 of the Detailed Description**.

Previously Canceled Claim 3 was reintroduced as **Claim 46**. Support for the amendment can at least be found in **Claim 3** as originally filed.

Claims 6 and 36 were amended to include aluminum in addition to aluminum alloys. Support can at least be found in Paragraph **0043 of the Detailed Description**.

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005.

page 13
August 9, 2005

Claim 11 was amended to provide a proper antecedent basis for "the memory cell" by inserting "formation of" and deleting "formation". Support for the amendment can at least be found in **Claim 1** as originally filed.

Claim 24 was also amended to correct grammar by changing "2 arrays" with "two arrays".

New **Claim 47** depends from **Claim 46** and recites at least two conductive metal oxide layers that are not identical to each other. Support for the amendment can at least be found in **FIG. 2D** of the Drawings and Paragraphs **0022.1 – 0022.7** and **0033** of the Detailed Description.

New **Claim 48** was added and recites that the memory cells in the memory array can include a non-ohmic device. Support for the amendment can at least be found in **FIG. 2c** and **FIG. 5** of the Drawings and Paragraphs **0022 – 0023, 0034 – 0035; 0037.06 – 0037.07; and 0044** of the Detailed Description.

No new matter was introduced in amending the claims.

ii. ARGUMENT

a. Rejection of Claims 1- 4, 7 – 10, 25 & 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (the 247/821 references)

Without commenting on the accuracy of the Examiner characterizing the conductive metal oxide layers as "at least two EPVR layers" or "EPVR first and second layers 404/406", the Applicant notes that the term EPVR does not appear in the Claims or the Specification of the present application and Applicant does not adopt or agree with the use of a term not disclosed in the present application.

The cited references U.S. Application **20040235247** and U.S. Patent **6,693,821** (*Hsu* hereinafter) taken individually or in combination do not disclose and do not render

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 14
August 9, 2005

prima facie obvious the elements recited in independent **Claim 1** as amended herein. Specifically, *Hsu* is silent and does not teach a memory array positioned over a substrate including active circuitry having multiple conductive paths, wherein the active circuitry and the multiple conductive paths are able to withstand high temperature processing at a first temperature. Although the cited sections of *Hsu* may discuss the suitability of various materials for electrodes, *Hsu* simply does not contemplate the possibility of building a cross point array directly over driver circuitry. If active circuitry shares the same footprint as the cross point array, the circuitry will be subjected to the same temperature profile as the memory itself. The Inventors recognition and solution to this issue led them to the present invention.

Accordingly, one skilled in the art upon reading *Hsu* would have no motivation to combine and/or modify the teachings of *Hsu* to arrive at the present invention as now claimed in **Claim 1**. Simply put, *Hsu* does not provide a road map that would lead one skilled in the art to combine its teachings and arrive at the present invention. Furthermore, all of the claim limitations of **Claim 1** are not taught or suggested by *Hsu*.

Consequently, independent **Claim 1** is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of *Hsu* and the rejection of **Claim 1** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn. **Claims 2 – 24** and **Claims 46 - 48** depend from independent **Claim 1** and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as argued above for **Claim 1**, **Claims 2 – 24** and **Claims 46 - 48** are not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of *Hsu* and the rejection of **Claims 2 – 24** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn. For the same reasons as argued for dependent **Claims 2 – 24**, dependent **Claims 46 – 48** are not prima facie obvious in view of *Hsu*.

Similarly, **Claims 26 – 32** depend from independent **Claim 25** and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as argued above for **Claim 25**, **Claims 26 – 32** are not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of *Hsu* and the rejection of **Claims 26 – 32** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 15
August 9, 2005

b. Rejection of Claims 5 – 6, 26 – 27, 33 – 37, 39 – 40, & 44 under 35
U.S.C. §103(a) (247/821/617 references)

Independent **Claims 33** and **44** and dependent **Claims 33 – 37** and **39 – 40** are not prima facie obvious under **§103(a)** in view of the **247/821/617** references taken individually or in any combination for at least the same reasons as argued above for independent **Claims 1** and **25**. Moreover, dependent **Claims 5 – 6** and **26 – 27** which depend from independent **Claims 1** and **25** respectively, are also not prima facie obvious under **§103(a)** in view of the **247/821/617** references. First, neither of the *Hsu* references discloses all of the claim limitations as now recited in amended **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44**. Second, the reference U.S. Application **20030179617** (*Gudesen hereinafter*) is also silent, does not teach, and does not disclose all of the claim limitations as now recited in amended **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44**.

Finally, *Gudesen* disclose structures for reducing fatigue in memory device employing capacitance based ferroelectric cells having organic, polymeric electrets, or ferroelectrics based materials (see paragraphs 0004 – 0006). Accordingly, one skilled in the art upon reading the **247/821/617** references would not have a reasonable expectation of success in applying the combined teaching of *Hsu* with the capacitance based cell teachings of *Gudesen* and arrive at all the claim limitations set forth in **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44**.

The Examiner has explained *Gudesens'* low-processing-temperature electrodes are used "so as to minimize diffusion." However, the Examiner simply has not addressed the aspect of the present invention where completely different materials are used for top and bottom conductive array lines. Unlike electrodes, conductive array lines can be orders of magnitude longer than the memory element itself. Accordingly, conductive array lines can dramatically contribute to the overall electrical characteristics of the memory. The Inventors have realized that although bottom conductive array lines will be subjected to a high temperature profile, after the memory elements are formed, the top conductive array lines do not need to be exposed to similar temperatures. Accordingly, both high temperature and low temperature materials can be used, reducing overall resistance (and overall power requirements) of the memory array.

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 16
August 9, 2005

Consequently, **Claims 5 – 6, 26 – 27, 33 – 37, 39 – 40, and 44** are not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the **247/821/617** references and the rejection of those claims under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** ought to now be withdrawn.

c. Rejection of Claims 11 – 23 & 29 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)
(247/821/801 references)

For at least the same reasons as argued above for independent **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44**, **Claims 11 – 23 and 29 – 33** are not prima facie obvious in view of the **247/821/801** references taken individually or in any combination because all of the claim limitations in independent **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44** are not disclosed in the cited **247/821/801** references. Moreover, as for the U.S. Patent **6,544,801** reference (*Slaughter hereinafter*), the MRAM device and its MJT cells are co-fabricated in the same layer of the semiconductor substrate as the CMOS circuits that are used to access/control the MRAM device. Therefore, the cited sections of *Slaughter* are silent and teach away from fabricating a memory array over a substrate that includes active circuitry as is now recited in independent **Claims 1, 25, 33, and 44**. Moreover, because the MRAM device/MJT cells are co-fabricated on the same substrate as the CMOS circuitry, there is no need and no motivation for separate high and low temperature processing profiles. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine/modify the teachings of the **247/821/801** references to arrive at the present invention.

Consequently, **Claims 11 – 23 and 29 – 33** are not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the **247/821/801** references and the rejection of those claims under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** ought to now be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 17
August 9, 2005

d. Rejection of Claims 38 & 41 - 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (247/821/617/801 references)

Because **Claims 38 and 41 - 42** depended from amended independent **Claim 33** and inherit all of its limitations, those claims are not prima facie obvious in view of the **247/821/617/801** references taken individually or in any combination for at least the same reasons as argued above for **Claim 33**. Namely, all of the claim limitations as now recited in **Claim 33** are not taught or suggested by any combination of the **247/821/617/801** references. Accordingly, **Claims 38 and 41 - 42** are not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the **247/821/617/801** references and the rejection of those claims under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** ought to now be withdrawn.

e. Rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (247/821/882 references)

For at least the same reasons as argued above for independent **Claim 1**, dependent **Claim 24** is not prima facie obvious in view of the **247/821/882** references taken individually or in any combination because all of the claim limitations in **Claim 1** are not taught, suggested, or disclosed in the cited **247/821/882** references. Moreover, the one-time programmable anti-fuse based memory cell of the U.S. Patent **6,034,882** reference (*Johnson hereinafter*) teaches away from the readable/writeable/re-writable non-volatile resistance based memory cell of the present invention because the anti-fuse based memory cell of *Johnson* cannot store a different value of data once it has been programmed (i.e. the fuse is blown). In sharp contrast, data stored in the readable/writeable/re-writable non-volatile resistance based memory cell of the present invention can be over written with new data by applying the appropriate voltage pulses. Therefore, *Johnson* discloses a write-once, one-time-programmable, and a non-analogous art that would not lead one skilled in the art to arrive at the re-writeable memory of the present invention. Consequently, **Claim 24** is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the **247/821/882** references and the rejection of **Claim 24** under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** ought to now be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 18
August 9, 2005

f. Rejection of Claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (247/821/627/944 references)

For at least the same reasons argued above for independent Claim 33, dependent Claim 43 is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the 247/821/627/944 references taken individually or in any combination because all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 33 are not taught or suggested by those references. Additionally, the non-ohmic device as disclosed by the U.S. Patent 6,331,944 reference (*Monsma hereinafter*) does not render Claim 43 §103(a) obvious because one skilled in the art upon reading *Monsma* and the remaining 247/821/627 references would not be placed in possession of all of the claim limitations recited in independent Claim 33. Therefore, Claim 43 is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the 247/821/627/944 references and the rejection of Claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

g. Rejection of Claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (247/821/882/617 references)

For at least the same reasons argued above for independent Claim 1, dependent Claim 45 is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the 247/821/882/617 references taken individually or in any combination because all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by those references. One skilled in the art upon reading the cited references would not be placed in possession of all of the claims limitations set forth in Claim 1 from which Claim 45 ultimately depends. The problem of temperature driven diffusion in the ferroelectric device of *Gudesen* would not lead one skilled in the art to conclude that a non-refractory a top metal layer would be required for the memory array of the present invention because the memory cells are already formed at a high temperature. Therefore, Claim 45 is not prima facie obvious in view of the cited sections of the 247/821/882/617 references and the rejection of Claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.


Application No. 10/765,406
Responsive to the Final Office Action of June 9, 2005

page 19
August 9, 2005

iii. **CONCLUSION**

Applicant now believes the present case to be in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application the undersigned can be reached at (408) 737-7200 x124.

Respectfully submitted,
Unity Semiconductor Corporation



Trueman H. Denny III
Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 44,652

250 North Wolfe Road
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4510